

Previous Applications

Approved Cases

Application No.	Applied Use	Date of Consideration	Approval Conditions
A/K3/567	Proposed Office and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction	4.12.2015	(i), (ii), (iii) & (iv)
A/K3/571	Proposed Flat, Shop and Services	26.10.2016	(iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (vii) & (viii)
A/K3/577	Proposed Flat, Shop and Services	10.11.2017	(ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (vii) & (viii)

Approval Conditions

- (i) Provision of car parking and loading/unloading facilities
- (ii) Submission of a sewerage impact assessment (SIA)
- (iii) Implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA
- (iv) Provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting
- (v) Design, provision and maintenance of the pedestrian walkway at the Fuk Chak Street Extension open for public use 24-hour
- (vi) Submission and implementation of tree preservation and landscape proposal
- (vii) Design and provision of the internal transport facilities and vehicular access
- (viii) Implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified in the Noise Impact Assessment Report

Similar Applications

Approved Cases

Application No.	Address	Applied Uses	Date of Consideration	Approval Conditions
A/K3/346	18-30 Bedford Road, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon	Proposed Residential and Retail Development	14.5.1999	(i) & (ii)
A/K3/377	7 Arran Street, Mong Kok, Kowloon	Proposed Residential and Retail Development	19.10.2001	(i) & (iii)
A/K3/441	7 Arran Street, Mong Kok, Kowloon	Proposed Commercial/Residential Development	14.1.2005	(i), (iv) & (v)
A/K3/476	7 Arran Street, Mong Kok, Kowloon	Proposed Flat	3.2.2006	(i) & (v)
A/K3/535	7 Arran Street, Mong Kok, Kowloon	Proposed Flat	28.1.2011	(i), (v) & (vi)

Approval Conditions

- (i) Time clause
- (ii) Design, provision and arrangement of car parking, loading/unloading facilities and vehicular access
- (iii) Provision of noise mitigation measures
- (iv) Design and provision of setback
- (v) Provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations
- (vi) Submission and implementation of a landscape proposal

Detailed Comments from Relevant Government Departments

Technical Comments on Environmental Assessment

Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection

Noise

1. Section 2.6.1, 1st sentence: “*are summarized in Error! Reference source not found..*” is noted, please amend as appropriate.
2. Section 2.7:
 - (a) Please explain the design and sound attenuation of the proposed Enhanced Acoustic Window (Baffle Type), especially compared to the Acoustic Window (Baffle Type).
 - (b) The numbering and subtitles of the mitigation measures are inconsistent/duplicated. Please amend as appropriate.
3. Section 2.7.9: Please mention the design of the proposed maintenance U.P. with Auto-Close door as well.
4. Section 2.7.20: Should the second sentence read "... mentioned in S.2.7.15"?
5. Section 2.7.24 and Appendix E: The consultant should justify with on-site measurement results, if any or other supporting materials, to substantiate the additional sound attenuation of 1 dB(A) as claimed for the Enhanced Acoustic Window (Baffle Type) and additional sound attenuation of 2 dB(A) as claimed for the Enhanced Acoustic Balcony (Baffle Type).
6. Section 4.1.1: The NSR should read “N1-70” instead of “N1-74”.
7. Figure 2a and Appendix D: Please review if N1-71 and N1-72 at 3/F are valid assessment points which are located outside the fixed glazing window.
8. Appendix B: Please advise whether the TD's endorsement on the forecast traffic data is applicable to the subject planning application.
9. Appendix D:
 - (a) The subtitle for table 4 (under a.m. and p.m. scenarios) should include Enhanced Acoustic Window (Baffle Type).
 - (b) Should the claimed maximum sound attenuation for Enhanced Acoustic Window (Baffle Type) read 6.5 dB(A) with reference to the table in Appendix E.
10. Appendix E:
 - (a) The tables should include all NSRs with different noise mitigation measures.
 - (b) Second table: Should MPA be applied on the EAB?
 - (c) Second table: Please provide the outer opening area, inner opening area and air gap of the Acoustic Balcony (Baffle Type) of the reference case.

Technical Comments on Sewerage Impact Assessment

Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection

1. Section 3.2.1:
 - (a) Please provide the reference source of the “average occupancy” adopted for estimating the numbers of resident and employee of the proposed development, which seems to be under-estimated.
 - (b) Some buildings in the concerned sewerage catchment were omitted in the calculation (e.g. Tai Yick Building). Please clarify
 - (c) Reference source of the GFA of the concerned downstream developments should be provided.
2. Section 3.2.3: The scope of the proposed upgrading works is inconsistent with that in Appendixes A & B (i.e. should the sewer between FMH4011007 and FMH4011004 be upgraded to 300mm dia?). Please clarify.
3. Table 2 of Appendix B:
 - (a) It is noted that less conservative value of roughness coefficient (ks) was adopted. Please review the roughness coefficient for more conservative estimation (i.e. adopt ks under “Bad” condition to account for the long-term deterioration of sewer condition).
 - (b) Please correct the calculation of “% of Spare Capacity”.
4. Table 3 of Appendix B:
 - (a) Please provide reference source / calculation of the “Backwash Flow Rate per each Filter (l/s)”, which seems to be under-estimated.
 - (b) It is noted that the “Filtration Pump Flow Rate” and the “Backwash Flow Rate per each Filter” are different. Please confirm if it is the case in the actual operation of the filtration system.
 - (c) The project proponent is advised to arrange backwash of sand filters at non-peak period as far as possible.
 - (d) According to EPD’s ProPECC PN5/93, filtration plant backwash should be discharged to foul sewers while swimming pool main drain, footpath main drain and swimming pool make-up tank drain should be connected to stormwater drains. Please include the flow from backwash in the hydraulic calculation.

Comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department

1. Section 3.2.1 - There are two towers in ‘Eltanin Square Mila’. Please clarify if all sewage flows from this catchment area are assumed to be contributing to the downstream sewage pipeline (via Location 3) under assessment, or only part of the flows while the other part to be received by other sewers on the other side of this site.

2. Section 3.2.1, the table under Section 3.2.2 and Table 2 in Appendix B - As indicated in remarks of Table 2 and in Table 3, in Appendix B, there should be swimming pools in the proposed development and in 'Eltanin Square Mila'. Please explicitly indicate so by showing the relevant descriptions and estimated sewage flows accordingly.
3. Table 2 in Appendix B - The selection of peaking factor should be based on the calculation of contributing population, which should be in accordance with paragraph 12.1 of the EPD's Guidelines, not the actual/planned population.
4. Table 2 in Appendix B - Catchment inflow factor should be applied in calculating the average flows and contributing population, not only the peak flows.
5. Section 4 - According to the calculation in Table 2 in Appendix B, the existing sewers between manholes FMH4011007 and FMH4010944 should be upgraded to 300 mm to 375 mm diameter, not all to 375 mm diameter. Please review the wording. In addition, please state the proposed material for clarity.
6. Table 2 in Appendix B - Please review the calculation of '% of spare capacity' which should be the available capacity out of the total capacity (not the usage).
7. Table 2 in Appendix B - Please review all the wording 'Peak flow' under the column of 'Accumulated DWF, ADWF (L/s)'.
8. Table 2 in Appendix B - In the sub-table checking the spare pipe capacity at Location T, the 'downstream sewerage' should be 'proposed', not 'existing'.
9. Table 2 in Appendix B - Please note that the existing sewers concerned are of different pipe materials: vitrified clay for the sewers between manholes FMH4011007 (Location 0) and FMH4011004 (Location 1), and concrete for the sewers between manholes FMH4011004 (Location 1) and FMH4010944, according to our drainage records. Please review the assumed Manning's coefficient values accordingly.
10. Table 2 in Appendix B - Please note that the downstream invert level of the existing sewers between manholes FMH4011005 (Location 2) and FMH4011006 (Location 3) should be +3.10 mPD, not +2.90 mPD. Please review the calculation of the hydraulic gradient accordingly. Please also review if the proposed upgrading works need to be revised.
11. Table 2 in Appendix B - Please note that the downstream invert level of the existing sewers between manholes FMH4011006 (Location 3) and FMH4010944 should be -0.04 mPD, not +0.04 mPD. Please review the calculation of the hydraulic gradient accordingly. Please also review if the proposed upgrading works need to be revised.
12. Table 2 in Appendix B - Please elaborate on how would the proposed upgrading works (subject to any changes to the propose upgrading works) be 'adequate without submerged or backflow'. Please show the estimated water level and/or profile to support your statement where appropriate.

Advisory Clauses

- (a) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department (LandsD) that:
- (i) the applicants are reminded that offensive trades or businesses (e.g. restaurant, bar) are not permitted at the concerned lots within the application site;
 - (ii) the applicants are advised that the proposed short term tenancy (STT) will only be considered upon receipt of their formal application to LandsD. There is no guarantee that the application, if received by LandsD, will be approved. In the event that the STT application is approved, it would be subject to such terms and conditions as the Government shall deem fit, including, among others, payment of rent and administrative fee as may be imposed by LandsD; and
 - (iii) regarding the projection outside the concerned lots at 2/F over Kok Cheung Street (presumably a canopy), comments will be provided at the building plan submission stage;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that:
- (i) the proposed development should in all aspects comply with the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and its allied regulations;
 - (ii) the existing lane at the northern boundary is not a required service lane for the scheme itself under Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 28(1) but serves as a Street for purpose of site classification. Moreover, based on the approved record of the adjoining building at 31-41 Kok Cheung Street, the existing lane (including northern portion of the Site and the southern part of the adjoining building) has been serving as a Street under the provision of the BO. In this respect, the subject lane should not be included in the site area calculation under B(P)R 23(2)(a); and
 - (iii) detailed comments under the BO will be given at the building plan submission stage;
- (c) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) that C for T has the rights to impose, alter or cancel any car parking, loading/unloading facilities and/or any no-stopping restrictions, on all local roads to cope with changing traffic conditions and needs. The frontage road space would not be reserved for any exclusive uses of the subject development;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department that the applicants should be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed pedestrian walkway at Fuk Chak Street Extension at their own cost;
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that the applicants should address the technical comments on the Environmental Report and Sewerage Impact Assessment Report at **Appendix IV** of MPC Paper No. A/K3/585 to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be associated with adverse noise and sewerage impacts with the implementation of proper mitigation measures (if necessary);
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department that

the applicants should address the technical comments at **Appendix IV** of MPC Paper No. A/K3/585;

- (g) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access shall comply with the “Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings” which is administered by the Building Authority;
- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department that:
 - (i) the applicants should explore the possibility to integrate the existing public footpath adjoining the southern boundary of the application site with the proposed pedestrian walkway to improve the walkability of the pedestrian connection in a holistic approach;
 - (ii) the applicants should consider incorporating continuous pedestrian weather protection along the building edges of the proposed development; and
 - (iii) the applicants are advised to liaise with LandsD on the treatment of the Government land to enhance the landscape quality of the proposed pedestrian passage in a holistic manner; and
- (i) to note the comments of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services that:
 - (i) the applicants shall liaise with the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited in respect of the exact locations of existing or planned gas pipes/gas installations within/in the vicinity of the application site and any required minimum setback distance away from them during the design and construction stages of development; and
 - (ii) the applicants are required to observe the requirements of the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department’s ‘Code of Practice on Avoiding Danger from Gas Pipelines’.